Edmonton Area Series Report No. 56

# MIGRATION TO A CANADIAN METROPOLITAN CITY: CHARACTERISTICS AND MOTIVES

by

Akin Adebayo

Population Research Laboratory
Department of Sociology
The University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta

The 1981 Edmonton Area Study (EAS) was administered and supported by the Population Research Laboratory and the Department of Sociology at The University of Alberta. The author gratefully acknowledges the comments and suggestions provided by Harvey Krahn, but accepts sole responsibility for the content of this paper.

November 1987

## Abstract

This paper examines, first, the characteristics of migrants to the city of Edmonton and their motives for migration. Second, reasons for migration are analyzed for 'pre-1970' and 'post-1970' migrants. The results suggest that (1) an overwhelming majority of migrants intended to stay in Edmonton indefinitely, (2) in general, economic reasons were obviously the most influencing factors in migration to the city, (3) marriage and educational opportunities were cited more frequently among post-1970 migrants as reasons for migration compared to pre-1970 migrants, (4) economic factors in migration were relatively dominant before 1970, while noneconomic factors (education and marriage) increased in importance as explanation of post-1970 migration stream. The paper concludes by suggesting that the stereotype of "economic" motives pulling people to the city of Edmonton in the 1970s might have been exaggerated.

# MIGRATION TO A CANADIAN METROPOLITAN AREA: CHARACTERISTICS AND MOTIVES

## Introduction

Alberta, one of the three prairie provinces in western Canada, has undergone some remarkable economic and demographic changes in the past decades. The provincial economy was primarily agriculture, forestry, and fishing before 1945, but afterward, a more balanced economy based on oil, gas and coal emerged in the province as a result of the Leduc oil discovery of 1947 and brought a shift in the occupational structure of the province. A significant shift in the occupational structure of the labour force was manifested in the proportion taken up by mining, manufacturing and construction sectors after 1947.

The economic buoyancy of the 1970s oil boom made Alberta's economy one of the strongest in Canada. During this period, Alberta became one of the fastest-growing provinces in Canada. For example, during 1976-1981 the population of Alberta increased by 21.7 percent (Statistics Canada, 1986:28). In contrast to previous decades, in-migration was, for the most part, the primary parameter of demographic change in Alberta. In fact, Alberta received the largest net inter-provincial migration gain of all the provinces and territories in Canada during its unprecedented oil boom. Despite the recent economic turnaround in Alberta, it remained the fastest-growing province between 1981 and 1986, with a population increase of 6.1 percent (Statistics Canada, 1987:28).

## The City

Edmonton is the largest prairie metropolitan area. The city, like many other state or provincial capitals, has a long history of

inmigration. For example, between 1966-1971, migrants to the city of Edmonton from elsewhere in Canada totalled 152,500. This figure accounted for about 7.1 percent of total migrants to Canada's 21 Census Metropolitan Areas (Gertler and Crowley, 1977:73).

Edmonton has experienced substantial economic and demographic changes, especially during the mid-1970s when Edmonton had experienced a much stronger economy in both construction and service industries as a result of the oil boom. For example, the population of Edmonton increased by 11.7 percent during the 1971-1976 period and became the second fastest-growing city among Canada's census metropolitan areas during the 1976-1981 with an unprecedented growth rate of 18.1 percent (Statistics Canada, 1987). Today, half of the population of Alberta reside in Calgary and Edmonton.

In spite of the long history of net migration to Edmonton, recent research attempting to analyze the migration process has focused primarily on migrants coming to Alberta during the boom period (see, for example, Tepperman, 1985; Kennedy and Mehra, 1985, Currie and Halli, 1987). Consequently, questions have not been asked about the characteristics of migrants who came to Edmonton before the 1970s. Why and where did they come from? Did they have different reasons for migration than did the more recent migrants? Following this line of inquiry, this research is an exploratory attempt to examine the characteristics of migrants and reasons for migration both before and during the most recent oil boom of the late 1970s to Edmonton. This analysis is relatively unique in the sense that it examines migration streams during two different periods, "boom" and "staple" economy.

## Literature Review

Historically, metropolitan areas have been dependent upon different forms of migration (internal or international) for growth (Hauser, 1960). In many metropolitan cities in Canada or elsewhere, the vast majority of the residents were born and raised in a community (rural or urban) different from the one in which they presently live (Hawley and Zimmer, 1970:7). With particular reference to Canada, Gertler and Crowley (1979:22) explain:

> ...the real thrust of urbanization has derived in large measure from internal migration within Canada. Native Canadians and their immigrant counterparts have exhibited little inclination to remain permanently settled in one location. The seemingly inexorable growth of cities, especially the more populous and prosperous ones, has been fuelled by migration - from farmstead to urban neighbourhood, from sleepy town to bustling city, from Maritime outport to Ontario metropolis. Migrants have converged on the metropolis from rural areas, from smaller urban places, from other metropolitan areas, from out-of-province and from overseas (immigrants have demonstrated a proclivity for seeking the largest urban centres). They have come for many and diverse reasons: some driven by a lack of opportunity in the home area; others attracted by money and jobs at the destination; and still others to avail themselves of the diverse cultural pursuits that the metropolis can offer. They represent critical resources for the social and economic advancement of the city: youth, vigour, high education, professional and managerial status.

The early awareness of migration in the population dynamics of metropolitan areas led many researchers to document and analyze the phenomena that regulate the migration process. Beginning with the groundbreaking studies of (Thomas, 1938; Ravenstein, 1885; Bogue, 1959; Lee, 1966), researchers have long been concerned with the constellation of factors affecting the migration process. Without attempting an exhaustive list of factors affecting migration, it has been well-established that differential migration is, for the most part, a

function of economic, social, ecological, and psychological factors.

The importance of economic determinants of migration patterns has been aptly documented (Stouffer, 1940; Lansing and Mueller, 1967; Shaw, 1975; Arnold and Cochrane, 1980; Todaro, 1969; Dejong and Gardner, 1981; Greenwood, 1981; Dejong and Fawcett, 1981). For example, Greenwood (1981) contends that migration is in the direction of higher average incomes and lower levels of unemployment. It has been admitted that people move to the larger urban centres in Canada for greater economic opportunities (Statistics Canada, 1980). As Grant and Vanderkamp (1976:3-4) explain,

> ... in most cases the migration decision is related to job opportunities. A condition necessary for a person to make the decision to migration to another region is that we perceive the existence of an employment opportunity in that region.....

Some authors have argued that economic indicators alone cannot explicate net migration (Rhoda, 1983; Findley, 1977; 1980; Ritchney, 1976; Sofranko and Williams, 1980). Sofranko and Williams (1980) have noted a decline in noneconomic reasons for migration particularly among different age groups. In a study conducted by Rhoda (1983), educational opportunity was the major reason given by migrants for moving.

Social contacts have been recognized as an important factor in the migration process. Fisher (1976) suggests that 'migratory networks' is a motivating factor in the decision to migrate to an urban area. In essence, migrants tend to migrate to areas where they have friends or relatives.

Other research has illustrated that psychological factors play an important role in the migration decision process. For example, family ties, length of residence, ties to the community of present residence, and

home ownership may create emotional ties which may force individuals to remain in a particular location (Morrison, 1967; Toney, 1976; Uhlenberg, 1973).

Among the more consistent differentiating factors in migration patterns are age, social status, education, occupation, employment status, marital status, and ethnicity (Bogue, 1959; Goldscheider, 1971; Heaton et al. 1981; Sandefur, 1985; Shryock, 1981; Trovato and Hill, 1983). As noted in research, age is an important factor in the decision to migrate. The young are more mobile than the old. As Grant and Vanderkamp (1976:17) observed, the "peak migration rates are observed for the 20-24 age group; thereafter, the rate continuously declines until the age of 64."

In an analysis of migration which involved a broad range of ages, Heaton et al. (1981) found that economic motives were more salient in the decision to migrate by the young, whereas noneconomic variables were more important in making migration decisions by older individuals. This finding suggests that the economic benefits of geographical mobility decreases as age increases.

Economic status has been shown to have an influence on the propensity to migrate (DaVanzo, 1981; Findly, 1977). Individuals with low incomes are more likely to migrate than high-income persons. Others have argued in the contrary that people in the upper income levels are more likely to migrate because they can bear the costs and risks of geographical relocation (Dinerman, 1978; Bowles, 1970). Regardless of class, the unemployed and the educated have been found to manifest a greater probability of geographical mobility (Davanzo, 1978; Bartel 1979).

The combined effect of education, income, occupation and social status plays an important factor in the decision to migrate (Stone, 1979; McVey, 1978; Burch, 1978).

In summary, the literature provides us with basic generalizations about differential migration. Using the literature as background information, this research endeavour attempts to expand our knowledge of the characteristics of migrants and reasons for migration to the city of Edmonton, especially before the oil boom.

## Data and Methods

The data for the analyses are from the February 1981 fifth annual Edmonton Area Study (EAS) conducted by the Population Research Laboratory of the Department of Sociology at the University of Alberta. These data are suitable for the proposed analyses because the 1981 Edmonton Area Survey contains a battery of information on respondents' residential history, demographic background, and other accompanying variables that permit migration analysis. The sampling frame was a computerized list of household addresses compiled by the City of Edmonton in 1980. A simple random sample of 534 addresses was selected for structured interviews. Either the wife or husband was eligible for interviewing. Any member of the household over 18 years of age was equally eligible for the one-hour interview (see Kinzel, 1981 for selection procedure guidelines).

## Measures

Migrants in the context of this report are determined by respondents' answers to the following question, "Have you always lived in Edmonton?" Only those who answered "no" to this question as opposed to "yes" are considered to be migrants. A total of 347 respondents out of the final sample of 400 indicated that they have not always lived in the city of Edmonton. The additional restriction of migrants to those who moved to Edmonton when they were 18 years of age and over resulted in the

loss of 89 cases in the sub-sample of 347 migrants leaving 258 in-migrants.

Independent variables included age, sex, marital status, education, length of residence in previous community, and housing tenure (whether the respondents owned or rented). Respondents were also asked whether they had secured a job in Edmonton before migrating. Frequencies for each variable are shown in Table 1.

In presenting the analysis, we first describe some of the sociodemographic background of the sample. Next, we examine the 'pull-factors', i.e. the reasons for migration, and call particular attention to economic, educational, family-related and other marginal reasons. We also present the results of tabular analysis where reasons for migration (economic, educational and family-related) are differentiated by selected independent variables.

Lastly, the comparison of data for two different types of migrants - "pre-1970 migrants" and "post-1970 migrants" - allows us to compare characteristics and reasons for migration to the city of Edmonton across cohorts who arrived in different periods.

## Findings

Prior to a discussion of the reasons cited by migrants for moving to Edmonton, a brief description of the socio-demographic distribution of the sub-sample will be presented. Table 1 depicts the socio-demographic characteristics of those who have moved to Edmonton over the years. About 52 percent of the respondents were male, while 48 percent were female. The age distribution of the respondents at survey showed that 19 percent were aged 25-34 years. Those 18-25 and 35-44 accounted for 12 percent and 16 percent, respectively. The mean age of the respondents was 44 years.

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF MIGRANTS BE SELECTED SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

| Variable | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| GENDER | | |
| Male | 133 | 52 |
| Female | 125 | 48 |
| AGE DISTRIBUTION | | |
| Under 29 | 67 | 26 |
| 30 to 44 | 75 | 29 |
| 45 to 54 | 41 | 16 |
| 55+ | 75 | 29 |
| MARITAL STATUS | | |
| Single | 99 | 38 |
| Married | 132 | 51 |
| Others | 27 | 11 |
| LEVEL OF EDUCATION | | |
| Less that high school | 99 | 38 |
| High school | 58 | 22 |
| Some college | 61 | 24 |
| University degree | 30 | 16 |
| TYPE OF OCCUPATION | | |
| Professional, management, teaching | 82 | 32 |
| Sales, services, and clerical | 87 | 44 |
| All other | 89 | 34 |
| RELIGION | | |
| No preference | 36 | 14 |
| Protestant | 129 | 50 |
| Roman Catholic | 60 | 23 |
| Other | 33 | 13 |
| INDUSTRY OF WORK | | |
| Manufacturing | 25 | 10 |
| Construction | 23 | 9 |
| Trade | 33 | 12 |
| Commercial business and services | 96 | 37 |
| Other | 81 | 32 |
| SIZE OF COMMUNITY OF RESPONDENT GREW UP | | |
| Under 1,000 | 109 | 42 |
| 1,000 to 49,999 | 68 | 26 |
| 50,000 | 81 | 32 |

continued...

| Variable | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| LENGTH OF TIME INTENDED IN EDMONTON | | |
| Less than 1 year | 7 | 3 |
| 1-3 years | 19 | 7 |
| 4-5 years | 29 | 11 |
| Indefinitely | 203 | 79 |
| LABOUR FORCE STATUS | | |
| Employed full-time | 138 | 53 |
| Employed part-time | 26 | 10 |
| Unemployed | 14 | 6 |
| Retired | 22 | 8 |
| In school | 10 | 4 |
| Keeping house | 48 | 19 |
| PLACE LIVED IN BEFORE EDMONTON | | |
| Maritimes | 5 | 2 |
| Quebec | 7 | 3 |
| Ontario | 30 | 11 |
| Prairies | 145 | 56 |
| B.C. | 25 | 10 |
| Territories | 2 | 1 |
| Foreign | 44 | 17 |
| JOB IN EDMONTON BEFORE COMING | | |
| Yes | 77 | 31 |
| No | 172 | 65 |
| NA | 9 | 3 |
| INCOME | | |
| Under 6,000 | 16 | 6 |
| 6,000-15,999 | 47 | 18 |
| 16,000-29,999 | 73 | 28 |
| 30,000-49,999 | 63 | 25 |
| 50+ | 59 | 23 |

The distribution of marital status of the sample indicated that an overwhelming majority (61 percent) were married, while single respondents made up 16 percent. With respect to educational background, 38 percent had less than high school, 22 percent had some college education, while 10 percent and 6 percent had bachelor and graduate degrees, respectively.

There are considerable differences in the size of community of origin among the respondents. Approximately 16 percent of the migrants came from cities of comparable size to Edmonton, while 27 percent came from rural-farm communities. More than half (56 percent) moved to Edmonton from the prairies (Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba), 17 percent from foreign countries, 11 percent from Ontario, while 10 percent came from British Columbia. About 37 percent of the respondents had been in Edmonton beween 1-5 years at the time of the survey. Another 15 percent claimed to have been in Edmonton between 6-10 years. Those who migrated to Edmonton before 1970 and after represented 40 percent and 60 percent of the sample, respectively. An overwhelming majority of the respondents (79 percent) intended to stay indefinitely in the city. More than half of the migrants (53 percent) were employed full-time and 10 percent were employed part-time, while only 6 percent were unemployed at the time of the survey. The majority of the respondents (54 percent) were in the 1,600-49,999 income range. Also, about 36 percent were in commercial business and services, while 14 percent were in trade. Only 30 percent of the respondents secured a job before migrating to the city.

## Reasons for Migration

Data presented in Table 2 show a breakdown of the main reasons respondents have for moving to the city of Edmonton. Respondents were provided with a card which contained a list of possible reasons for

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF MIGRANTS' REASONS FOR MIGRATION

| Reasons for Migration | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| ECONOMIC | | |
| Loss of Employment | 10 | 4 |
| Job Transfer | 17 | 6 |
| Job Opportunities | 101 | 39 |
| Other | 9 | 4 |
| EDUCATION | | |
| FAMILY-RELATED | | |
| Marriage | 23 | 9 |
| To be closer to family | 23 | 9 |
| Family move | 8 | 3 |
| Family reasons (unspecified) | 7 | 2 |
| To be further away from family | 3 | 1 |
| OTHER | 25 | 10 |
| TOTAL | 258 | 100 |

Note: Percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding.

migration (see Appendix A). The 25 possible reasons listed on the card were grouped into four major categories: economic, education, family-related and others. For our analysis, we operationalized 'economic' reasons as reasons given to improve the respondents' economic situation at the time they moved. The economic reasons include inter alia, loss of employment, job transfer and job opportunities. Educational opportunities become the second category. Although one may argue that education falls under the economic purview, in this analysis, we juxtapose educational pursuit with long-term rather than short-term economic goals. Family-related factors include marriage, family move, to be closer to family, to be further away from family and other unspecified family reasons. Other factors include retirement, change desired and so forth.

As indicated in Table 2, approximately 53 percent of the migrants associated their migration with economic reasons particularly with job opportunities (39 percent). This suggests that economic reasons and the desire to improve one's condition were the most salient reasons given by the respondents for moving to the city of Edmonton. Educational opportunities was reported by about 11 percent of the sub-sample as their main reason for moving. The economic boom of the 1970s coupled with the establishment of many educational institutions in Edmonton lured many people to study in an environment where jobs were readily available. This finding is consistent with other metropolitan migration studies in which educational opportunities were cited among the main reasons for moving to an urban area (Rhoda, 1983).

Collectively, about 24 percent of the respondents moved to Edmonton for family-related reasons, especially for marriage and the desire to be closer to family members. This suggests that metropolitan in-migration is also a family matter as manifested by previous migration

research (Davanzo, 1976; Harbison, 1981; Stark, 1982; Wood, 1981; Currie and Halli, 1985). As reflected in the characteristics of our sample, 38 percent were married of the time they moved to the city of Edmonton. This may partially explain the distribution of family-related factors. One factor which was not often cited as reasons for migration was retirement.

Tabular Relationship

To understand the relationship between characteristics and reasons for migration, we present some cross-tabulations. Reasons for migration (economic, educational, family-related and other) is employed as a dependent variable (unless indicated otherwise). Table 3 presents the bivariate relationships between some selected variables. These variables were chosen on the basis of emphasis in past research which include age, gender, marital status financial situation, occupation, level of education, length of time intended in Edmonton, and family relationship.

Table 3 presents chi-square values associated with reasons for migration and some selected variables. As reflected in this study, but also in other studies cited in the literature review section, age, gender, marital status, occupation, level of education, financial situation, family relationship and length of time in Edmonton were all significant, indicating that reasons for migration are independent of some of these variables. As expected, (1) males are more likely to migrate for economic reasons than females, and (2) females are more likely to move for family-related reasons than males. Also, as expected, married women are more likely to migrate for family-related reasons than single women. The young are more inclined to migrate for economic and educational reasons than are the old.

TABLE 3

CROSSTABULATION OF REASONS FOR MIGRATION BY SELECTED VARIABLES

| Selected Variables | $x^2$ | Level of Freedom | Level of significance |
|---|---|---|---|
| *1. Age | 26 | 9 | .00 |
| *2. Gender | 15 | 3 | .00 |
| *3. Marital status | 30 | 15 | .00 |
| **4. Financial situation | 43 | 3 | .00 |
| **5. Family relationship | 23 | 6 | .00 |
| *6. Occupation | 19 | 6 | .00 |
| *7. Education | 19 | 9 | .00 |
| *8. Length of time | 8 | | |
| intended in Edmonton | 24 | 15 | .05 |

* Categories for each variable are indicated in Table 1.

** Used as a dependent variable.

Note: Crosstabulation tables are available from the authors.

## Migrant Comparison

In our effort to better understand the characteristics of the migrants, we further divided our sample into two groups: post-1970 migrants and pre-1970 migrants because the 1970s were a time of rapid oil-based economic growth. These were 142 post-1970 migrants and 116 pre-1970 migrants. According to our descriptive analysis, migration to the city of Edmonton during both periods was selective. There were more males among the most recent migrants than among the earlier ones. Among earlier migrants, males made up 55 percent of that stream. Among pre-1970 migrants, males constituted approximately 47 percent.

In other major respects, post-1970 migrants differ much from pre-1970 migrants, at least according to industry of work, size of community migrants grew up in and whether migrants secured jobs in Edmonton before coming. There were more recent migrants in construction, commercial business and services, and public administration while there were more earlier migrants in industries such as manufacturing and trade.

A large proportion of the earlier migrants grew up in rural communities (73 percent) compared to 36 percent of recent migrants who came from a community under 1,000. Among the most recent migrants, the majority of them (64 percent) came from urban areas similar to Edmonton. When respondents were asked whether they secured jobs in Edmonton before moving, an overwhelming proportion of both migrants indicated 'no'. However, there were more recent migrants who had jobs in Edmonton before moving (35 percent) compared to 24 percent of earlier migrants.

## Reasons for Migration (post-1970 and pre-1970 migrants)

Given the variations in the economic climate of Edmonton over the past decades, it is interesting to consider whether pre-1970 and post-1970

migrants gave different reasons for migration. Table 4 presents the reasons for migration for both pre and post-1970 migrants. The table indicates that economic reasons dominated both migration streams, suggesting that both migrants sought to settle where standard of living was more attractive. However, more recent migrants cited job transfer (12 percent) and loss of employment (6 percent) as reasons for migration, while almost half of the pre-1970 migrants cited job opportunities as their reasons for migration. In general, the data reveal that there were more economic reasons for migration before 1970.

The search for educational opportunities has always been an important 'pull-factor'. Approximately 20 percent of the post-1970 migrants came to Edmonton for educational purposes. A combination of reasons may account for this: (1) migrants wanted to be educated where jobs were readily available, and (2) the availability of educational institutions in Edmonton. Approximately 10 percent of those who came to Edmonton before 1970 gave educational reasons for migration. Marriage was cited more frequently among post-1970 migrants compared to pre-1970 migrants. It is also of interest to note that earlier migrants wanted to be closer to their families than the most recent migrants.

## Summary and Conclusions

This exploratory research has focused on the characteristics of migrants and their motives for migration to the city of Edmonton. Unique to the study is the analysis of two different migration streams - "pre-1970" and "post-1970". In general, the descriptive analysis which is undertaken here indicates that the overwhelming majority of migrants to the city of Edmonton intend to stay indefinitely. In general, economic reasons were the dominant forces pulling people to the city.

TABLE 4

REASONS FOR MIGRATION: PRE AND POST-1970 MIGRANTS

| Reasons for Migration | Post-1970 Migrants n=142 | | Pre-1970 Migrants n=116 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % |
| ECONOMIC | | | | |
| Loss of employment | 6 | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| Job transfer | 12 | 9 | 5 | 4 |
| Job opportunity | 46 | 32 | 55 | 47 |
| Other | 6 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES | 20 | 14 | 12 | 10 |
| FAMILY-RELATED | | | | |
| Marriage | 17 | 12 | 6 | 5 |
| To be closer to family | 10 | 7 | 13 | 11 |
| Family move | 2 | 1 | 6 | 5 |
| Family reasons (unspecified) | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| To be further away from family | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| OTHER | 16 | 11 | 7 | 6 |

Note: Percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding.

When reasons for migration for the pre-1970 migrants were compared to the post-1970 migrants, economic factors were more important before 1970 than in the 1970s. Approximately 56 percent of earlier migrants cited economic reasons. Noneconomic reasons (education and family-related factors) increased in importance as motives for post-1970 migration patterns suggesting that the stereotype of economic motives pulling people to Edmonton in the 1970s might have been exaggerated. It might also mean that people "forget" why they came.

The boom and bust nature of Edmonton's resource based-economy, the interdependence between Canadian metropolitan economic system, and the fact that the provincial government has its seat in Edmonton will make in-migration to the city a continuous process. Therefore, a search for more complex reasons for migration to the city of Edmonton deserves much more extensive analysis than this study provides. Further research should employ a larger sample to explore: (1) Return migration among Edmonton migrants in relation to economic changes; (2) Since an overwhelming majority of the migrants indicated that they intended to stay in Edmonton indefinitely, it would be of interest to investigate whether Edmonton migrants still hold this view in light of the present economic vicissitude; (3) Much more research is needed on the social factors holding migrants in Edmonton; (4) Variations in subjective well-being of pre-1970 and post-1970 migrants should be examined; (5) Since Edmonton is not considered a place for retirement, the implications of possible future outmigration of its migrants deserves critical attention.

## REFERENCES


Bartel, A.P. 1979. The migration decision: What role does job mobility play? American Economic Review 69:775-786.

Bogue, D.J. 1959. Internal Migration. In P.M. Hauser and O.D. Duncan (eds.), The Study of Population. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Bowles, S. 1970. Migration as investment: Empirical tests of the human investment approach to geographic mobility. Review of Economics and Statistics 52:178-193.

Burch, T.K. 1978. The Decision to Migrate. Unpublished manuscript. London: Population Studies Centre, University of Western Ontario.

Currie, R.F. 1987. Mixed Motivations For Migration in The Urban Prairies: A Comparative Approach. Edmonton Area Series Report No. 45. Edmonton: Population Research Laboratory, University of Alberta.

DaVanzo, J. 1972. Why Families Move: A Model of Geographic Mobility of Married Couples. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation.

DaVanzo, J. 1976. Family Migration Decisions: An Economic Model. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Population Association of America. Montreal.

DeJong, G.F. and J.T. Fawcett. 1981. Motivations for Migration: An Assessment and a Value Expectancy Research Model. Chapter 2 in G. DeJong and R.W. Gardner (eds.), Migration Decision Making. New York: Pergamon Press.

DeJong, G.F. and R.W. Gardner. 1981. Migration Decision Making Multidisciplinary Approaches to Microlevel Studies in Developed and Development Countries. New York: Pergamon Press.

Dinnerman, I.R. 1978. Patterns of adaptation among households of U.S.-bound migrants from Michoacan Mexico. International Migration Review 12:485-501.

Gertler, L.O. and R.W. Crowley. 1977. Changing Canadian Cities: The Next 25 Years. Toronto: MaClelland and Stewart Ltd.

Goodman, I.L. 1981. Information, uncertainty, and microeconomic model of migration decision making. Pp. 130-148 in G.F. DeJong and R.W. Gardner (eds.), Migration Decision Making: Multidisciplinary Approach to Microlevel Study in Development and Developing Countries. New York: Pergamon Press.

Grant, E.K. and John Vanderkamp. 1976. The Economic Causes and Effects of Migration: Canada, 1965-1971. Ottawa, Ontario: Economic Council of Canada.

Harbison, S.F. 1981. Family structure and family strategy in migration decision making. Pp. 225-251 in G.F. DeJong and R.W. Gardner (eds.), Migration Decision Making: Multidesciplinary Approaches to Microlevel Studies in Developed and Developing Countries. New York: Ronald Press.

Hauser, P.M. 1960. Population Perspectives. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Hawley, A.H. and B.G. Zimmer. 1970. The Metropolitan Community: Its People and Government. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.

Heaton, T.B., W.B. Clifford, and G.V. Fuguitt. 1981. Temporal shifts in the determinants of young and elderly shifts in the determinants of young and elderly migration in nonmetropolitan areas. Social Forces 60:41-60.

Kennedy, L.W. and N. Mehra. 1985. Moving to Get Ahead: Does It Pay? Edmonton Area Series Report No. 45. Edmonton: Population Research Laboratory, University of Alberta.

Kinzel, Clifford. 1981. Selected Findings From the 1981 Edmonton Area Study. Edmonton Area Series Report No. 20. Edmonton: Population Research Laboratory, University of Alberta.

Lansing, J.B. and E. Mueller. 1967. The Geographical Mobility of Labour. Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, University of Michigan.

Lee, Everett. 1966. A theory of migration. Demography 3:47-57.

Morrison, P.A. 1967. Duration of residence and prospective migration: the evaluation of a stochastic model. Demography 4:553-561.

Ravenstein, E.G. 1889. The laws of migration. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society 52:241-301.

Sandefur, G.D. 1985. Variations in interstate migration of men across the early stages of the life cycle. Demography 22:353-366.

Shryock, N.S. and E.A. Larmon. 1965. "Some longitudinal data on internal migration". Demography 2:579-592.

Sofranko, Andres J. and James D. Williams. 1980. Rebirth of Rural America: Rural Migration in the Midwest. Ames: North Central Regional Center for Rural Development, Iowa State University.

Statistics Canada. 1980. Perspectives Canada III. Ottawa: Supply and Services.

Statistics Canada. 1987. Canadian Social Trends, 1986 Census Highlights. Summer: Special Section.

Stone, L.O. 1978. The Frequency of Geographic Mobility in the Population of Canada. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.

Stork, O. 1982. "Rural-to-Urban Migration and Intrafamilial Risk-trading Agreements in LDCS". Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Population Association of America.

Stouffer, S.A. 1940. Intervening opportunities: A theory relating mobility and distance. American Sociological Review V:845-67.

Tepperman, L. 1985. Musical chairs: the occupational experience of migrants to Alberta, 1976-80. Social Indicators Research 16:51-67.

Thomas, D.S. 1938. Research Memorandum on Migration Differentials. New York: Social Science Research Council.

Toney, M.B. 1976. Length of residence, social ties and economic opportunities. Demography 13:297-309.

Trovato, Frank and S.S. Halli. 1983. Ethnicity and migration in Canada. International Migration Review 17:245-67.

Uhlenberg. P. 1973. Noneconomic determinants of nonmigration: sociological considerations for migration theory. Rural Sociology 38:296-311.

Wood, C.H. 1981. Structural changes and household strategies: a conceptual framework for the study of rural migration. Human Organization 40:338-344.

Zuiches, J.J. 1970. In-migration and growth of nonmetropolitan urban places. Rural Sociology 35 (September):410-20.

## NOTES

[1] The fact that 87 percent of our final sample were in-migrants suggests that migrants play an important role in the demographic landscape of Edmonton.

[2] In 1981, when this study was conducted, Edmonton posted on of the lowest rates of unemployment among Canada's metropolitan areas. The economic atmosphere at that time partially explains the unprecedented number of respondents who indicated that they wanted to stay in Edmonton indefinitely.

## APPENDIX

List of factors influencing the decision to migrate to the city of Edmonton, 1981.

Loss of employment
Job tranfser
Job opportunities
Marriage
Lower commuting
Access to school
Educational opportunities
Climate
Cost of living
Cost of housing
To own property
To live in single dwelling unit
Friendly community
More privacy
Closer to family
Further from family
Want more space
Quality of unit
Family move
Retirement
Family reasons (unspecified)
Opportunities in Edmonton/Winnipeg (unspecified)
Closer to friends
Change desired
Other
Nothing
N/A

## EDMONTON AREA SERIES

43. Perceived Risk of Occupational Injury: The Impact of Occupational Hazardousness, Type of Work, and Recent Personal Injury Accidents.
W. Andrew Harrell. September 1985.

44. Quality of the Urban Environment as Perceived by Residents of Slow and Fast Growth Cities.
Raymond F. Currie and Charlene Thacker. September 1985.

45. Moving to Get Ahead: Does it Pay?
Leslie W. Kennedy and N. Mehra. October 1985.

46. Accident History, Perceived Risk of Personal Injury, and Job Mobility as Factors Influencing Occupational Accident Fatalism.
W. Andrew Harrell. November 1985.

47. The Redistributive Effects of Lotteries in Western Canada.
John R. Livernois. February 1986.

48. Public Explanations of Unemployment in a Canadian City.
G.S. Lowe, H. Krahn, J. Tanner and T.F. Hartnagel. March 1986.

49. Effects of Unemployment on Psychological Well-being.
Wei-Jung J. Yeung and P. Krishnan. June 1986

50. Edmonton Area Study Sampling Report 1986.
Clifford Kinzel. June 1986.

51. 1987 All Alberta Study (including the Edmonton Area Study) Sampling Report.
Cliff Kinzel. May 1987.

52. Perceived Quality of Life in a Centre: Periphery Framework
J.R. Oppong, R.G. Ironside and L.W. Kennedy. June 1987.

53. The Incidence of Wife Assault in Alberta.
L.W. Kennedy and D.G. Dutton. July 1987.

54. Mixed Motivation for Migration in the Urban Prairies: A Comparative Approach.
Raymond F. Currie and Shiva S. Halli. October 1987.

55. Drunk-Driving Intervention in an Urban Community: An Exploratory Analysis.
Akin Adebayo. October 1987.